

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/605,343	MOORE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Theresa T. Snider	1744	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Theresa T. Snider.

(3) _____.

(2) Kristopher K. Hullibarger.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 October 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic

Video Conference

Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

25 rejected under 102 by Kowalewski; 42 rejected under 102 by Marsolais

Claims discussed:

1-18, 21-35 and 37-46

Prior art documents discussed:

Kowalewski, Marsolais

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed Mr. Hulliberger that claim 1 is allowable, as amended. Claim 1 describes the embodiment of figs. 4-8B. HOWEVER dependent claims 25-27 relate to the embodiment of fig. 9 and dependent claims 42-43 relate to the embodiment of figure 18. Mr. Hulliberger agreed to amend claims 25 and 42 into independent form. Mr. Hulliberger agreed to delete 'said vacuum unit' from Claims 5-8 because the limitation does not relate to the embodiment of amended claim 1. Claim 24 would be amended to correct the typo. Examiner noted that claim dependent 25 was rejected under 102 by Kowalewski. Mr. Hulliberger agreed to limit the transport mechanism to be integrally formed with the vacuum unit and for the waste container to have slots that mate with projections of the transport mechanism. Examiner noted that dependent claim 42 was rejected under 102 by Marsolais. Mr. Hulliberger agreed to limit the sub-transport mechanism to move in tandem with the transport mechanism. The sub-transport mechanism of Marsolais is used to offload the vacuum unit and to move without the transport mechanism. Examiner agreed with the suggested changes the application would be in condition for allowance. Mr. Hulliberger agreed to submit a supplemental amendment with the above discussed amendments.